

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 7, and 11 have been amended to clarify that each extension in the table comprises a predetermined number of common digits thereby facilitating the retrieval of the extension, wherein the extension is associated with a user of one of the wireless units. Support for this amendment may be found on page 15, line 21 through page 16, line 27 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-16, and 18 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery (US 6,011,975).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-16, and 18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Emery. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies, in pertinent part, a table stored within the communications element or the MSC, the table comprising a wireless entry for each of the wireless units operating in the communications network, each wireless entry including a wireless extension and a corresponding wireless number for the wireless unit, wherein each extension in the table comprises a predetermined number of common digits thereby facilitating the retrieval of the extension, wherein the extension is associated with a user of one of the wireless units.

It is respectfully submitted that the Emery fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, Emery fails to disclose a table comprising a wireless entry for each of the wireless units operating in the communications network, each wireless entry including a wireless extension and a corresponding wireless number

for the wireless unit, wherein each extension in the table comprises a predetermined number of common digits.

Emery discusses the use of an AIN network to provide special services to subscribers (such as members of a Centrex group) placing outgoing calls. The subscribers may have an extension dialing plan or be provided with an abbreviated dialing option so that a limited number of digits may be utilized to access data in the ISCP to determine the complete destination number. The extension plan or abbreviated dialing option may represent a minimum number of digits of a called station's number. See Col. 23, lines 51-65 and Col. 24, lines 48-51.

Emery however, fails to disclose or suggest a table in which wireless entries, each of which includes a wireless extension and a corresponding wireless number for a wireless unit operating in a communications network, all have extensions comprising a predetermined number of common digits thereby facilitating the retrieval of an extension associated with a user of a wireless unit. In contrast, Emery fails to specifically disclose a table of wireless entries and merely discusses the use of an extension plan or abbreviated dialing option for making outgoing calls. Thus, Emery fails to specifically disclose a commonality among the digits in a group of wireless extensions which would facilitate the retrieval of an extension from the table to call a user's wireless unit, as specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, Emery fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 5, and 13-16 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 7 and 11 specify similar features as amended claim 1 discussed above, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of

these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 12 and 18 depend from amended claim 11, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: January 7, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

